

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Derek Murashige / Docket #: 0009
Application No.: 10/662,998 / Examiner: Chelcie Daye
Filing Date: September 16, 2003 / Art Unit: 2161
Title: **METHOD FOR IMPROVING A WEB SITE'S RANKING WITH
SEARCH ENGINES**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Dear examiner:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed August 14, 2006 (hereafter OA), please accept this Amendment and accompanying Request for Continued Examination, Fee Transmittal and Agenda from a an interview with the examiner.

Applicant wishes to thank the examiner for the August 30, 2006 telephone interview and for the examiner completing an Interview Summary. The attached Agenda was provided to the examiner prior to the interview and gives the substance of the interview. During the interview applicant asserted the proposed claims in the Agenda, particularly with the addition of the limitation of "for registration" to clarify why a Web site is being submitted to a search engine, were patentably distinct from the prior art of record. The examiner maintained that the proposed claims were obvious in light of the prior art of record. The prior art specifically discussed was Feeley et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0068460) and Dooley (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035611). No agreement was reached between the applicant and the examiner regarding patentability. Applicant

09/15/2006 TL0111 00000048 503134 10662998

02 FC:1201 1000.00 DA
03 FC:1202 1950.00 DA

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 14 2006****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Inventor: Derek Murashige / Docket #: 0009
Application No.: 10/662,998 / Examiner: Chelcie Daye
Filing Date: September 16, 2003 / Art Unit: 2161
Title: **METHOD FOR IMPROVING A WEB SITE'S RANKING WITH
SEARCH ENGINES**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AGENDA

Dear examiner Chelcie Daye:

I would like to discuss the following matters in a telephone interview, which I believe will place the claims in condition for allowance.

1. As shown in the attached proposed claims, Applicant is proposing deleting "substantially" in claim 9 and 17. This should moot the examiner's rejection for indefiniteness and make it clear that the program analyzing the Web site only has to use ranking methodologies that are similar (as opposed to "substantially" similar) to the ranking methodologies used by the selected search engines.
2. Applicant proposes adding "for registration", in two places, to claims 1, 9, and 17. The claims previously referred to submitting the Web site to a search engine and with the addition of "for registration" make it clear that the Web site is submitted to the search engine(s) "for registration". The process for submitting a Web Site to a search engine for registration is described on page 4, lines 20-26 in the patent application.